DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 319 CE 067 262

TITLE Military Installation Voluntary Education Review (MIVER). Final Report. Fiscal Years 1991-1993.

INSTITUTION American Council on Education, Washington, DC. Center for Adult Learning and Educational Credentials.

PUB DATE 94

NOTE 39p.; For related documents, see CE 067 263-264.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Educational Assessment; *Educational Cooperation; *Educational Facilities; Educational Planning; *Educational Principles; *Educational Quality; *Military Service; Military Training; Models; Postsecondary Education; Program Effectiveness

IDENTIFIERS *Military Installation Voluntary Education Review

ABSTRACT

The Military Installation Voluntary Education Review (MIVER) Project has two purposes: to assess the quality of selected on-base voluntary education programs and to assist in the improvement of such education through appropriate recommendations to institutions, installations, and the military services. MIVER site team members assessed the quality of the voluntary education at 24 installations. They used the "MIVER Model" to review the installation needs assessment, education planning, and implementation process as well as facilities, resources, leadership, climate for learning, and communications that foster effective working relationships among both installation and institutional education personnel. One of the reasons that the MIVER process works so well is the design of the site team assignment structure. Team members have multiple assignments. Horizontal, vertical, and functional involvement provide opportunities for most of them to have a minimum of three assignments. The MIVER staff and governing board have pulled together key "principles" in 12 areas for installations and 10 areas for institutions using the common threads of excellence and concerns in military education observed by MIVER teams among the services over the past 3 years. (Two summaries outline installation and institution commendations and concerns that are examples of MIVER team findings. Names and addresses of contacts are provided.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 374 319

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Military Installation Voluntary Education Review (MIVER)

Final Report

Fiscal Years 1991-1993

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E N Swanson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Center for Adult Learning
and Educational Credentials
One Dupont Circle, Suite 250
Washington, DC 20036-1193
202/939-9722 (voice)
202/775-8578 (fax)

CE 067 262

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Military Installation Voluntary Education Review (MIVER)

Final Report

Fiscal Years 1991-1993

Center for Adult Learning
and Educational Credentials
One Dupont Circle, Suite 250
Washington, DC 20036-1193
202/939-9722 (voice)
202/775-8578 (fax)

Table of Contents

Background Information **3**
Introduction 3
Purposes of MIVER Project 3
Site Visits 5
Categories of Review 6
The "MIVER Model" 7
The "Accreditation Model" 7
Figure 1 8
Figure 2 9
Site Team Members 10
Team Processes 10
Experience of Personnel 12
The MIVER Governing Board 13
Principles of Good Practice 13
Background Summary 14

Summary of Installation
MIVER Commendations and Concerns
Fiscal Years 1991-93 ..... **15**

Summary of Institution
MIVER Commendations and Concerns
Fiscal Years 1991-93 ..... **27**

Points of Contact **37**

Background Information

Introduction

The American Council on Education's Center for Adult Learning and Educational Credentials served as the project contractor for the Military Installation Voluntary Education Review (MIVER) Project for fiscal years 1991, 1992, and 1993. It was responsible for coordinating military installation visits in cooperation with the Department of Defense's Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, the military services, and educational institutions that support the installations being visited. Site team members, selected from a central pool that was developed for the Project, carried out the actual reviews according to the policies and procedures established by the MIVER Governing Board. By the end of the three year contract period, MIVER site visitor teams had visited 34 sites in 22 distinct geographic areas since its first visit on April 28, 1991. MIVER Final Site Visit Reports now exist for Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps installations that the MIVER Project visited in the United States and abroad.

Purposes of the MIVER Project

The MIVER Project has two purposes: (1) to assess the quality of selected on-base voluntary education programs, and (2) to assist in the improvement of such education through appropriate recommendations to institutions, installations, and the military services.

Providing postsecondary education on military installations is a cooperative undertaking between the military services and postsecondary institutions. Maintaining and improving the quality of voluntary education are common objectives and concerns of the installations, the supporting educational institutions, and the military services. The accrediting associations and state higher education approving agencies have considerable interest in the

quality of educational programs on military installations.

MIVER site team members understand the communal character of voluntary education on military installations, the joint responsibility of institutions and installations in maintaining and improving quality, and the relation of institutional programs both to each other and to the installation's educational needs. Military installations require a periodic review not just of the individual institution's offerings but, also, of the total installation postsecondary education program as well.

It is DoD policy for the military services to establish voluntary education programs that provide opportunities for servicemembers to achieve educational, vocational, and career goals. MIVER focuses on enhancing this policy. The military services provide servicemembers, subject to the requirements of military duties, access to educational opportunities available to other eligible citizens. Servicemembers are encouraged to use voluntary education programs to enhance their military effectiveness and prepare for positions of greater responsibility in the military services.

In accordance with DoD policy, voluntary education programs of the military services shall:

a. Be geared to programs, courses, and services provided by institutions and organizations, including high schools, postsecondary vocational and technical schools, and colleges and universities.

b. Include the resources and programs of other federal agencies, such as the Department of Education, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Veterans Affairs, and of the states, when possible.

c. Include educational guidance and counseling by qualified personnel.

DoD Directive 1322.8, dated July 23, 1987, sets forth this policy, accompanied with a listing of responsibilities and "Guidelines for Participating Personnel," "Guidelines for the Military Services to Establish Voluntary

Education Programs," and "Criteria for Obtaining Education Programs and Services."

The military services implement DoD Directive 1322.8, "Voluntary Education Program for Military Personnel," with their own regulations or instructions. The Army's implementing instructions are contained in Army Regulation 621-5. The Navy's implementing instructions are found in CNETINST 1560.3C. The Air Force's implementing instructions are contained in Air Force Regulation 213-1. ACE MIVER has assessed programs in light of this directive and the services' regulations or instructions.

The site team members assess the quality of the voluntary education programs by: (1) ensuring voluntary education on the military installation is appropriate and consistent with the standards of postsecondary education; (2) examining the nature of the relationship between the installation and each institution operating on that site from the perspective of DoD Directive 1322.8 and the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the institution and the installation; and (3) assessing the relevance of each institution's offerings on the installation to its own objectives and those of the installation. It is important to stress that MIVER reviews are for the purpose of quality assessment and enhancement and not for the purpose of accreditation; these reviews do not replace or supplant institutional accreditation.

Site Visits

Since the MIVER Project began on March 6, 1991, MIVER site visits have been conducted at the following installations: Fort Carson, Colorado (28 April- 1 May 1991); Fort Bragg/Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina (9-13 June 1991); Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota (14-17 July 1991); Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington; Naval Submarine Base, Bangor, Washington; Naval Air Base, Whidbey Island, Washington (4-9 August 1991); and Fort Jackson, South Carolina (22-25 September 1991).

In FY 92 the following military sites received a MIVER visit: Fort Stewart, Georgia (17-20 November 1991); Tri-Services Education Center, Naples, Italy (19-28 March 1992); Fort Polk, Louisiana (4-8 April 1992); Redstone Arsenal, Alabama (25-29 April 1992); Fort Sill, Oklahoma (9-13 May

1992); Fort Shafter, Schofield Barracks, Tripler Army Medical Center, Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor , and Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii (20-26 June 1992); Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio (11-16 July 1992); Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri (18-23 July 1992); and Goodfellow Air Force Base, Texas (25-29 July 1992).

In FY 93 the following military sites received a MIVER visit: Naval Base, Charleston, South Carolina (18-21 October 1992); Fort Huachuca, Arizona (15-18 November 1992); and Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (23-26 February 1993); Fort Riley, Kansas (4-7 April 1993); Marine Corps Air Stations, El Toro and Tustin, California (16-19 May 1993); Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado (11-14 July 1993); Military District of Washington (including Fort Myer, Fort Belvoir, the Pentagon, and Hoffman Army Education Center) (18-23 July 1993); and Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico (August 15-19, 1993).

Categories of Review

The final MIVER site reports and the end-of-year reports submitted by ACE under DoD Contract N00612-90-R-0284 over the past three fiscal years speak directly to the issue of credible, acceptable evaluation reports. Because of the unique nature of military installations as educational centers both in the United States and overseas and, especially, because of the presence on most installations of institutions from more than one region of the country, a common framework, (the MIVER *Categories of Review*), was appropriate and necessary for developing information for the installation-wide review that is relevant to the standards or criteria of the institutional accrediting bodies. This common reporting framework guided both the pre-site visit report and the final site report. Over the past three years, these *Categories*, as provided in the original contract, evolved with the full cooperation among MIVER administrators, site visitors, military educators, members of the MIVER Governing Board, and the staff of ACE's Center for Adult Learning and Educational Credentials.

These revised *Categories* constituted broad areas of information on which installation-wide reviews took place, regardless of installation location or the home campus locations of institutions providing education on that

installation. Based on these *Categories of Review* for Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and the *Quality Education System* categories of the Air Force, the MIVER Project produced quality assessment reports. MIVER administrators continuously refined reporting formats based on lessons-learned and feedback from users of the reports. Site team members received training on MIVER report writing through the *Team Visitor's Guide* developed by MIVER administrators.

The "MIVER Model"

The "MIVER Model," as implemented by ACE, focuses on the evaluation of voluntary education programs on a specific military installation. (See Figure 1.) The educational environment on the installation and installation program planning and program implementation become integral to the evaluation process. The education services professionals responsible for the voluntary education program on the installation assess the educational needs of installation personnel and develop a plan to meet these needs. Institutional programs and services are reviewed as part of the implementation of that education services plan based on assessed needs. MIVER site team members review the installation needs assessment, education planning, and implementation process as well as facilities, resources, leadership, climate for learning, and communications that foster effective working relationships among both installation and institutional education personnel.

The "Accreditation Model"

The "Accreditation Model" as contrasted to the "MIVER Model" focuses on evaluation of the home campus of the institutions serving on the installation perhaps with some review of off-campus programs and services. (See Figure 2.) Accreditation visits with institutions serving on a military installation, generally, do not take place in the same year. Also, they focus on the extent to which accreditation standards are being met, with the off-campus operation reviewed as an extension of the home campus. The "MIVER Model" focuses on the totality of the installation voluntary education program, with the role of the education center, the installation organization, and all institutions being equally considered.

Figure 1
MIVER Model

Focus of the evaluation: installation's voluntary education program

Figure 2
Accreditation Model

Focus of the evaluation: home campus

Site Team Members

ACE's development of a site team visitors pool of qualified site team members for the MIVER project over the past three fiscal years allowed for the selection of tailor-made teams specifically suited to programs and services at each individual site being visited. Most MIVER teams included members from several regional accrediting areas. MIVER administrators, in its team selection procedures, ensured diversity among team members. Team chairs provided outstanding leadership and produced well-prepared, comprehensive site reports in a timely manner. The MIVER administrators worked to expand the use of the site pool by trying to include a new site team visitor on each experienced team. This approach brought fresh perspectives to the MIVER process contributing to its selectivity and validity while maintaining continuity. The current site pool has 78 active members with 44% women and 23% minorities. From the first site visit in April 1991 through September 30, 1993, 62 different individuals participated on teams. Total site visitors used on all teams were 117. Site visitors have come from 26 states. 112 of these site visitors have a doctorate degree, while five specialists held a masters degree.

The willingness of distinguished educators from across the country to serve on these site visit teams is praiseworthy. The professionalism and cordiality that they brought to the MIVER process made each visit a productive and cooperative venture. For each visit, the MIVER site team members complimented the high degree of cooperation and assistance provided them by the military command, the installation education service officers and their staffs, and the institutional site directors, faculty, students, and other academic professionals. Even though each team was composed of different members with diverse backgrounds, MIVER teams showed an exceptional ability to work together and to reach sound conclusions in a very short period of time. This is a tribute to the highly qualified faculty and administrators that served on the site teams.

Team Processes

One of the reasons that the MIVER process works so well is the design of the site team assignment structure. Team members have multiple assign-

ments. Horizontal, vertical, and functional involvement provide opportunities for most of them to have a minimum of three different assignments:

- The first division of labor is by program area. Generally, more than one team member looks across (horizontally) an institution's academic programs due to the variety of offerings.

- A second division of labor is that one team member takes the responsibility for putting together an institution's total administrative and academic report (vertically) although that person may only participate in part of the inquiry.

- The third area is a functional assessment. Each team member has at least one cross-installation and institution functional responsibility to examine in such areas as counseling, learning resources, integration of non-classroom-based learning, facilities, and demographics.

Multiple assignments are particularly important to the team process. On the last evening prior to the exit interviews, team members present their written findings to the entire team. The team chair reports the highlights of these findings at the exit interview the following morning. The team chair conveys to the exit interview participants that these findings represent the consensus of the team rather than the viewpoints of an individual team member. When several team members share responsibilities in looking at particular institutions or functional areas, they provide greater input into the deliberations necessary to achieve consensus.

The team chair and the MIVER administrator conduct a pre-site visit for continental United States installations at least one month prior to the actual visit. This pre-site visit permits informing installation and institution personnel regarding the MIVER process and development of a working agenda. It also assists in finalizing the logistics of the visit.

Also, prior to the site visit, the team holds a telephone conference call for about one hour on a day suitable to all team members. The MIVER admin-

istrator, assistant administrator, coordinator, and team chair provide information and answer questions about the materials mailed to site team members: *MIVER Orientation and Guidelines, MIVER Reference Guide, MIVER Team Visitor Guide*, self-study reports, agenda for site visit, individual assignments, and logistics. Site visitors also meet on Sunday for further orientation and training. They receive briefings from representatives of the headquarters of the military services education sector, view a DANTES video, and discuss team logistics and assignments for the visit.

MIVER administrators make portable computers and printers available on site helping team members prepare a draft of their reports to share at the team meetings. After the team members return home, each prepares a final draft of his or her assignments to send to the team chair within 24 hours. The team chair then edits the report over several days and sends it to the MIVER office for in-depth review, further editing, and formatting. This process allows teams to reach consensus in a quick and professional manner. Generally, the MIVER staff sends out the error-in-fact report within two weeks after the visit. Installation and institution points of contact fax their comments within seven days directly to the team chair. The use of faxes, Internet, and express mail help speed up the process. ACE's Central Services/Printing Office contributes to the timely delivery of a quality product through its excellent, speedy service.

Experience of Personnel

MIVER administration has a solid foundation in ACE and its Center for Adult Learning and Educational Credentials. Henry A. Spille, Vice President of ACE and Director of The Center, provides general oversight for the project. The MIVER administration team is composed of E. Nelson Swinerton, Administrator, Clinton Anderson, Assistant Administrator, and Kim Meek, Coordinator. The MIVER staff developed a full array of forms, letters, and documents over the first contract period permitting MIVER administration to become increasingly more efficient and effective in managing the project. The MIVER Project, as administered by ACE, has the full support of the ACE Commission on Educational Credit and Credentials, the policy-making body for The Center on Adult Learning and Educational Credentials and its programs.

MIVER administrators and military educators work cooperatively together to articulate better the set of criteria and questions asked in self study reports. MIVER administrators help team members focus more directly on critical issues with particular attention to improving linkages between installations and institutions. MIVER administrators set common reporting styles based on good report writing procedures and feedback from those receiving the reports. In End-of-Year Reports, MIVER administrators were forth right in addressing major issues and identified areas of concern in DoD Voluntary Education and in the conduct of the MIVER process, itself.

The MIVER Governing Board

The MIVER Governing Board establishes policies and procedures for the site team visits to military installations, reviews documents, and advises the Department of Defense Education Activity (Continuing, Adult and Postsecondary Education) (DODEA, CAPSE) and the military services as necessary. The MIVER Governing Board consists of twelve members and meets twice a year. The members are selected as follows:

- one military officer from each of the military departments;
- the education service chiefs or their representatives;
- one former MIVER site team chair;
- one member from participating institutions;
- one member from the accreditation community; and,
- (Department of Defense Education Activity; Continuing, Adult, and Postsecondary Education) representative or designee serves as Governing Board Chair.

Principles of Good Practice

The MIVER staff and MIVER Governing Board members pulled together key *Principles* in twelve areas for installations and ten areas for institutions using the common threads of excellence and concerns in military education observed by MIVER teams among the services over the past three years.

Background Summary

MIVER has developed into an effective review methodology that is well accepted within the higher education community to facilitate improvements in adult and continuing education, particularly as it relates to servicemembers. Similar to ACE's development and implementation of the General Educational Development (GED) Testing Program, Military Evaluations Program, and ACE/Army Registry Transcript Service (AARTS) as DoD and military service initiatives, MIVER now stands as a model for emulation in other sectors such as business and industry interested in assessment and evaluation of their education and training programs. MIVER is respected as a legitimate function within higher education, thereby attracting the very best academic talent available to work in its service.

Summary of Installation MIVER Commendations and Concerns Fiscal Years 1991-93

The commendations and concerns, outlined below, are examples of MIVER team findings at one or more installations, institutions, or military services that may have some applicability elsewhere in the DoD Voluntary Education Program. The *Principles* as evolved over the three year period are italicized in the section below.

Installation Principle 1. Mission Statement

A Voluntary Education Program on a military installation evolves from an educational mission statement, compatible with the installation's mission, that reflects accepted adult education principles and practices and includes clear Voluntary Education Program objectives.

Commendation:

- Academic programs and services offered at installations reflective of programs and services in the higher education community.

Concerns:

- An education center without a clear mission to serve its clientele.
- An installation education center controlled by a military service school but served garrison servicemembers and servicemembers in outlying regions.
- DoD/military service civilians' use of the installation education center.

Installation Principle 2. Command Support

Installation command personnel have a strong commitment, reflected in concrete support of the mission statement and its Voluntary Education Program objectives, to help servicemembers fulfill their educational needs and aspirations.

Commendations:

- Strong, varied, and consistent command support.
- Command fiscal support for voluntary postsecondary education during tough budget times.
- Strong verbal command support even though the command needs to translate this support into an action plan for improvement.
- Command support for Program for Afloat Education (PACE).

Concerns:

- Lack of visible evidence of command support.
- Failure to follow Total Quality Leadership model.
- Need to simplify reporting lines.
- Lack of command priority for libraries.
- Combination of training and education may isolate education services officer.
- Need for command to support new and or improved facilities.
- Lack of education center signs on the installation. (The installation education center out-of-sight and out-of-mind for both the commander and the servicemember.)

Installation Principle 3. Personnel

Managers of the Voluntary Education Program are professional adult educators who hire, support, and develop education services professionals that are competent, caring, and committed.

Commendations:

- Education services officer and education center staff provide high level of service to clients, often under adverse circumstances.
- Education services professionals demonstrate dedication and commitment to collegiate education programs.
- Education center functions efficiently with a welcoming atmosphere and customer service orientation.
- Staff members including administration, counseling, testing, and learning centers, and the institutional site representatives cited for "their professionalism, enthusiasm, and effectiveness."
- Exemplary leadership by education services professionals cited.

Concerns:

- Inadequate staffing.
- Lack of effective communications, collaboration and cooperation between education services and academic professionals.
- Lack of mechanism for communications (e.g., coordinating group or council to discuss matter of mutual concern).
- Conflict among education services professionals.
- Little or no professional development opportunities.
- Excessive amount of academic inbreeding.
- Education services professionals without appropriate education credentials.

Installation Principle 4. Needs Assessment

An effective, timely educational needs assessment process is the foundation of Voluntary Education Program planning, development, implementation, and evaluation.

Commendation:

- Conduct of a comprehensive needs assessment that provided sound basis for educational planning, program acquisition, and implementation.

Concerns:

- No organized plan for needs assessment.
- Lack of assessment data.
- Student interests not reflected in needs assessment data.
- Military units not included in needs assessment.
- Lack of automated information management system to keep needs assessment updated.

Installation Principle 5. Education Program Planning

Comprehensive education program planning is the basis of Voluntary Education Program management and is guided by the results of the needs assessment.

Commendations:

- Vision and strategic planning cited.
- Innovative planning efforts to build an appropriate program to meet the educational needs of servicemembers, adult family members, civilian employees located on the installation.
- Planning and developing an instructional program (PACE) responding to the academic needs of sailors at sea by placing qualified faculty members on board ship teaching collegiate classes to qualified students cited.

Concerns:

- No systematic planning.
- Institutions not included in education planning.
- Need for command involvement in planning.
- Need for education services officer involvement in planning.
- Need to establish and maintain participation goals both for program and administrative planning.
- Need to explore non-traditional formats.
- Lack of basic skills or developmental skills needed for college-level work.

- Inability of servicemembers to complete degree program on isolated sites.
- Unwarranted duplication in course offerings on an installation.
- Need to plan for new commands or major shifting of troop populations.
- No time given to strategic, long-range planning.
- Lack of enforcement of course prerequisites and course sequencing.
- Need for closer coordination between associate and bachelor's programs.
- Programs indicated as "needed" in the needs assessment not offered.

Installation Principle 6. Education Program Acquisition

The installation maintains a process for identifying, acquiring, evaluating, and retaining academically qualified institutions that are committed to the Voluntary Education Program mission and its objectives.

Commendations:

- Revision of memorandum of understanding format that required institutions to ensure a reasonable proportion of tuition income—comparable to that of the home campus—is provided for education support (e.g., library holdings, laboratories, laboratory supplies, computer facilities, equipment, administrative services, student advisement).
- Contract for PACE I provided appropriate division of responsibility and an established framework for cooperative administration and problem solving between Navy Campus and the contract institution.

Concerns:

- Needs assessment and planning not translated into an effective educational delivery system.
- Education services officer not responsible for all the voluntary postsecondary education programs on the installation.
- Poorly developed memoranda of understandings (MOUs); unclear MOU specifications (in some cases, no MOU or contract at all).

- Institutions failing to comply with MOU specifications.
- Need for better articulation regarding provision of instructional resources.
- Lack of understanding regarding the use of distance learning programs to supplement on-installation offerings.

Installation Principle 7. Program Administration

Management of the human, fiscal, and learning resources is effective and reliable.

Commendations:

- Few student complaints of any kind.
- Education center and learning centers functioned efficiently.
- Development and implementation of highly effective fully automated management information systems.
- Outstanding management and record keeping operations.
- Effective "Education Partnership Committee" as a means of facilitating inter-institutional cooperation and program planning.
- Well-managed PACE program.

Concerns:

- Cumbersome administrative structure.
- Need for statistical data for effective decision-making and program planning.
- Need for comprehensive computerization of servicemember-student records.
- Problems with transfer of individual education records.
- No centralized or common record keeping procedure.
- Lack of a fully automated information management system.
- Institutions accepting tuition payments in cash without bonded cashiers or appropriate security.
- Need to outreach to more servicemembers.
- Inconsistency in available information regarding degree programs.
- Inadequate informational materials.

- Need for a common marketing calendar of course offerings.
- Need for regular meetings and partnership activities with institutional representatives, library personnel, and other installation support administrators.
- Need to coordinate library, computer and other learning resources provided by institutions and installation agencies.

Installation Principle 8. Student Services

The policies, procedures, and practices of the Voluntary Education Program take into account the conditions and circumstances of servicemembers as adult learners and promote the success of those learners through appropriate counseling, testing, financial aid, and other services.

Commendations:

- Counseling staff cited as a dedicated and caring group of professionals who work well together as a team.
- DANTES testing service functioning well.

Concerns:

- Inaccessibility of counselors.
- Lack of a DANTES testing service on several installations.
- Need for students to take greater advantage of standardized testing opportunities.
- Institutions need to provide greater student services on the installation.
- No comprehensive placement services available.
- Financial aid options not communicated to servicemembers.
- Failure to use installation telecommunication and other media resources to provide information to servicemembers regarding available education opportunities.

Installation Principle 9. Instructional Resources

There is a sufficient reservoir of instructional resources available to the instructor for teaching support and to the student for reference, research, and independent learning.

Commendations:

- Installation libraries serve as a valuable instructional resource for voluntary postsecondary education programs.
- Efforts to improve library facilities and services cited.
- Command librarian cited for foresight and skill in planning and developing the command automation initiative to upgrade existing systems of non-automated libraries.
- Installation library staff cited for efforts in providing library instruction and orientation tours to students and faculty and for efforts in maintaining a collection that includes materials of use to adult learners, and for their helpfulness and commitment to client service.
- Installation library cited for providing materials that support the educational research needs of its users.
- Library staff eager and competent to serve both civilian and military community.
- Exemplary attitudes of the librarians reflecting an active willingness to serve students in voluntary education programs.
- Head librarian recognized for high level of effort, dedication, and service to students.
- Installation library staff members cited for their heroic efforts to improve the installation library.
- Members of the library staff cited for high level of service and for foresight in developing a strong, comprehensive collection that properly supports the mission of the library.
- Installation library being a large, pleasant, well-maintained facility with a broadly based collection.
- A nearby state university library and city libraries cited for providing ready access to their materials to all students from the military installation without regard to the specific institution the student is enrolled.

- Construction and use of a model prototype learning center with customer/servicemember-oriented mission and philosophy of "one-stop" service.
- Centrally-located, well-organized learning center with up-to-date military and civilian education materials that are available during hours convenient to its users.

Concerns:

- Need for increased use of information technologies.
- Need for installation library improvements.
- Students lack skills in library use and research.
- Need stronger linkage between installation library and institutions offering programs on the installation.
- Lack of computer hardware, software and courseware.
- Computer hardware and courseware not appropriate.
- Doubtful performance of learning center operations.
- Poorly equipped learning centers with obsolete computers and other equipment.
- Learning centers and computer laboratories closed when needed by students.
- Installation library hierarchies hinder their support of voluntary education programs.
- Need for guide to library resources.
- Inadequate audio-visual support.

Installation Principle 10. Physical Resources

Facilities and equipment are appropriate to accomplish the mission and achieve the Voluntary Education Program objectives.

Commendations:

- Newly constructed education center.
- Education center/installation library under construction.
- Sailors of the fleet cited for willingness to have recreation rooms and other crew spaces assigned for classroom instruction for PACE Program.

- Model learning center construction.
- Existing space used in an attractive, functional manner.

Concerns:

- Facilities that provide poor learning environment.
- Need for new education facilities.
- Lack of classroom space.
- Small, minimally equipped, classrooms.
- Lack of space and privacy for counseling and academic advisement.
- Need to reconfigure and better use existing space.
- Need for painting and facility repair.
- Inadequate facilities for vocational programs.
- Inadequate installation library space.
- Inadequate furnishings and station equipment.
- Women's rest room facilities inadequate.
- Health, safety, maintenance, electrical problems.
- Inadequate parking.
- No classroom for natural sciences.
- Poor or non-existent custodial care.
- Unresourced requirements for telephone lines.
- Inadequate or no word processing, faxing, or copying equipment available.

Installation Principle 11. Financial Resources

Financial resources are adequate to accomplish the mission and achieve the Voluntary Education Program objectives.

Commendation:

- Reasonably adequate financial resources even in severe budget reduction environment.

Concerns:

- Tuition assistance budgetary shortfalls.

- Inequity in tuition assistance installation-to-installation, service-to-service, and, in some cases, among servicemembers in the same classroom.
- Education center operations budget shortfalls.
- Learning centers used for training but paid for with education funding.
- Need to increase supplemental financial assistance.
- Institutional failure to report financial data.
- Enormous institutional profits not reviewed by education services officer.
- Failure of institutions to enhance program with their profits whatever size.
- Need for education services officer to have operating budget.
- Lack of adequate funding for staff development.

Installation Principle 12. Student Assessment and Program Evaluation

Continuous and systematic assessment of student learning and Voluntary Education Program evaluation stimulate program improvement, promote quality, and ensure achievement of program objectives and student learning outcomes.

Commendations:

- Support provided MIVER process.
- Use of collegial and broadly-based "process action teams" in the conduct of the installation self-study.

Concerns:

- Internal quality control weak.
- No effective partnership between installation and institutions providing programs.
- Failure of education services officer and institutional representatives to obtain feedback from students regarding quality of instruction and support services, and experiences with facilities and equipment.

Summary of Institution MIVER Commendations and Concerns Fiscal Years 1991-93

The commendations and concerns, outlined below, are examples of MIVER team findings at one or more installations, institutions, or military services that may have some applicability elsewhere in the DoD Voluntary Education Program. The *Principles* as evolved over the three year period are italicized in the section below.

Institution Principle 1. Mission Statement

The institution providing voluntary education programs on a military installation has an educational mission statement that reflects sound adult education philosophy and goals and is clearly compatible with the installation Voluntary Education Program mission statement and objectives.

Commendations:

- Provider institutions cited for recognizing quality educational opportunities for servicemembers as part of their institutional mission.
- Institution's dedication to and support its program on the military installation.
- Inclusion of the institutional site director on the military installation as an integral part of the institution's administrative structure.
- Inclusion of the faculty of the on-installation program in academic decision-making along with on-campus faculty.

Concerns:

- Need for institution to review its mission and objectives for off-campus programs.

- Degree programs offered on installation but not on home campus.
- Institution inappropriate to offer courses on a military installation.
- Doubt whether an on-installation program serves institution's objectives and servicemembers' needs.

Institution Principle 2. Education Program

Education programs and services provided on military installations are comparable in quality with those provided on the home campus, even if different in kind and method of instructional delivery.

Commendations:

- High quality catalogs and excellent promotional and informational materials provided at the military installation.
- Well-planned programs that specifically addressed the needs of military personnel on the installation.
- Development and use of outstanding departmentally designed, course syllabi and outlines.

Concerns:

- Poorly developed syllabi.
- Course syllabi without learning outcomes.
- Failure to prepare comprehensive and detailed syllabi for students at a distance.
- Syllabi without detailed reading lists.
- Poor quality and outdated video tapes.
- Lack of appropriate curricular content.
- Insufficient contact hours for 3 semester hour course.
- Abbreviated intensive formats not justified in terms of learning outcomes.
- Need to monitor compliance in the conduct of study group sessions.
- Weak business core.
- Failure to articulate program learning outcomes.
- Bibliographies or course recommended reading lists not up-to-date.
- Lack of adjunct faculty involvement in curricula design and development.

- Poor general education core.
- Little evidence that students in upper-division courses use research methods or tools.
- Business and public administration program graduates lack computer skills.
- Business and public administration program graduates lack an understanding of global and ethical issues.
- Failure to include any computer applications.
- Excessive overlap in curricular content.
- Failure to enforce prerequisites.
- Excessive duplication of course offerings on the installations.
- Courses needed for degree completion only available during the day.
- Need for alternative methods of course delivery.
- Problems with course sequencing.
- Need for developmental education.
- No formal assessment of student's basic skills.
- Excessively high credit requirements for technical diplomas and associate degrees.

Institution Principle 3. Personnel

Qualified and dedicated faculty and other academic and student services professionals committed to serving servicemembers as adult learners are hired, supported, and provided professional development opportunities.

Commendations:

- Institutional site directors and supporting staffs cited for outstanding services for the military students.
- Institutional faculty for professional performance and dedication to teaching military personnel and their adult family members.
- Development and use of faculty handbooks and other faculty and staff development materials particularly suited for off-campus operations.

Concerns:

- Institutional site director with ill-defined role.
- Need for stable program leadership.
- Need for site director to be proactive and visible.
- Need for staff development.
- Faculty credentials weak.
- No full time faculty.
- Need to reduce faculty teaching load.
- Excessive amount of academic inbreeding.
- Need for faculty diversification.
- Lack of faculty meetings.
- Lack of faculty development.
- Lack of faculty awareness regarding adult students and life-long learning.
- Need for faculty with ability to use computer applications.
- Difficulties with faculty orientation and commitment to teach military students.
- Need for more institutional student services professionals on the installation.

Institution Principle 4. Program Administration

Administration of the program includes academic and student services and demonstrates effective and reliable management of human, fiscal, and learning resources.

Commendation:

- Well-managed institutional office on the installation.

Concerns:

- Lack of timely home campus administrative support.
- Institutions need to participate in education planning with installation.

- Lack of security and integrity of class examinations (e.g., for independent study courses).
- Failure to properly equip site director's office.
- Delay in processing tuition assistance payments.
- Inconsistency in information regarding degree programs.
- Need for marketing brochures.
- Course scheduling changes and cancellation caused student hardship.
- Need for statistical data to assess program effectiveness.
- Inability to capture essential data.
- Inadequate communications links between the institution's on-installation personnel and the home campus.

Institution Principle 5. Student Services

The policies, procedures, and practices of the institution supporting the Voluntary Education Program take into account the conditions and circumstances of servicemembers as adult learners and contribute to the success of those learners through appropriate student admissions, registration, assessment of prior learning, academic advisement, financial aid, and other services.

Commendations:

- On-campus academic advisors and the on-installation institutional staff for providing excellent advising services to students on military installations.
- "Pro-active support of the SOCAD system" for Army students and family members.
- Highly qualified academic professionals conducting the evaluation and transcripting credit for prior college work and related military training.

Concerns:

- Need for more academic advisement.
- Need to purge list of course offerings.

- Failure of instructor to notify students of class meeting changes.
- Need to review policy and practice of awarding credit for experiential learning.
- Failure to process a SOCAD Student Agreement for Army students on a timely basis.
- Failure to conduct official evaluation of students' prior learning and develop a degree completion plan.
- Difficulty in contacting students and faculty in case of emergency.
- Need to strengthen career counseling and placement services.
- Production of transcripts not geared to off-campus schedule.
- Education services professionals engaged in textbook sales and service.
- Textbooks not available at beginning of classes.
- Confusion among students regarding graduation requirements.
- College registration conducted by education services professionals rather than institutional staff.

Institution Principle 6. Instructional Resources

There is a sufficient reservoir of relevant instructional resources available to the instructor for teaching support and to the student for reference, research, and independent learning.

Commendations:

- Establishment and maintenance of computer laboratories for its students but often used by other students of other institutions offering programs on the installations.
- Institution offering graduate programs cited for "operating an extensive and effective off-campus library service that is a model for the extension of library support to non-traditional students."

Concerns:

- No learning resources available.
- Course materials unavailable at start of class.
- No instructions for students on how to access local library resources.

- No program for providing library services to off-campus clientele.
- Need for home campus librarian to work with on-campus students and librarian.
- Institution's library collection located at the installation library out-of-date.
- Need to access institution's home campus library via telecommunications.
- Poor access to periodicals.
- Need to upgrade equipment used in vocational instruction.
- Need to upgrade audio-visual instructional resources.
- Computer resources inadequate.
- Need to upgrade computers.
- Need to provide greater access to a suitable computer laboratory.
- Need to examine use of CD-ROM technology for storage of library materials.

Institution Principle 7. Physical Resources

Facilities and equipment are appropriate to support the programs and services offered.

Commendation:

- Institution addressed critical space limitations on the military installation by leasing appropriate space conveniently located off-base at least temporarily until the installation can provide suitable space on the installation.

Concerns:

- Inadequate facilities.
- General lack of space.
- No science laboratories.
- No privacy for academic advisement.
- Unwillingness to upgrade drab and poorly equipped offices.
- Inadequate or no word processing, faxing, or copying equipment available.

Institution Principle 8. Financial Resources

Financial resources are adequate and appropriately used to accomplish the mission and achieve program goals and objectives.

Commendations:

- Use of sound financial practices.
- Grants and scholarships particularly for adult family members.
- Grants by an institution through its endowment funds to family members in excess of $100,000 over the past three years.
- Tuition refund policies during times of troop mobilization and/or unexpected deployment (e.g., Desert Shield/Desert Storm Operations).

Concerns:

- No inclusion of financial resource information in self study.
- Need for reinvestment particularly in instructional and computer areas.
- Need to provide financial support to installation library.
- Enormous net institutional profits troubling.
- Exorbitant indirect cost rates troubling.

Institution Principle 9. Student Assessment

The assessment of a student's learning is based on the achievement of comprehensive and specific learning outcomes.

Concerns:

- Problem of grade inflation.
- Grade distribution at graduate level questioned.
- Lack of systematic assessment of student learning outcomes.
- Uneven assessment of student learning outcomes.

Institution Principle 10. Program Evaluation

Continuous and systematic program evaluation stimulate program improvement, enhance quality, and increase the likelihood of the achievement of program mission and objectives.

Commendations:

- Use of full range of academic mechanisms to ensure that programs on the installation and its constituent courses are academically sound and meet campus standards.
- Excellent methods of quality control through their home campus.

Concerns:

- No organized program of student and alumni assessment.
- General need for quality assurance and external evaluation.
- Lack of student assessment and program evaluation policy.
- Lack of course and program evaluation and review.
- Lack of data for thorough program evaluation.
- Need to assess the academic achievement of students enrolled in interim session courses.
- "Study group" format needed a formalized, externally-validated assessment program to measure its effectiveness.
- No learning outcomes stated and measured for the program.
- No consideration of program effectiveness for important subgroups of students (e.g., minorities, females, transfer students, academically at-risk students, honors students, adult family members).
- No consideration of effectiveness of important academic processes (e.g., faculty teaching, student learning, advisement).

Points of Contact

For further information, contact:

Henry A. Spille
Vice President and Director
The Center for Adult Learning and Educational Credentials
The American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 250
Washington, DC 20036-1193
202-939-9475
FAX: 202-775-8578
INTERNET: Henry_Spille@ACE.NCHE.EDU

E. Nelson Swinerton
Administrator, MIVER
The Center for Adult Learning and Educational Credentials
The American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 250
Washington, DC 20036-1193
202-939-9723
FAX: 202-775-8578
INTERNET: Al_Swinerton@ACE.NCHE.EDU

Clinton L. Anderson
Assistant Administrator, MIVER
The Center for Adult Learning and Educational Credentials
The American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 250
Washington, DC 20036-1193
202-939-9722
FAX: 202-775-8578

Kim Meek
Coordinator, MIVER
The Center for Adult Learning and Educational Credentials
The American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 250
Washington, DC 20036-1193
202-939-9722
INTERNET: Kim_Meek@ACE.NCHE.EDU

Carol Osborn
COTR, MIVER
DANTES, Code 20
6490 Saufley Field Road
Pensacola, FL 32509-5243
904-452-1085
FAX: 904-452-1161
INTERNET: vanhoose@s5.info.,wpatb.af.mil
or dantescs@s6.info.wpatb.af.mil

The American Council on Education
Center for Adult Learning and Educational Credentials
One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 250
Washington, DC 20036-1193